

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,352	02/16/2001	Joerg Heuer	1454.1012	2838

21171 7590 02/27/2004
 STAAS & HALSEY LLP
 SUITE 700
 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
 WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,352

Applicant(s)

HEUER, JOERG

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,34,36 and 38-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,34,36 and 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 16 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding "A standard structure is not disclosed in Machihara" have been considered but are not persuasive. As set forth on lines 25-28 of page 3 of the specification, in the present application descriptors such as "catalog number," "data," ... are defined as standard descriptors, typically in string format, and are known on both the query side and database side for a standard structure. The information retrieval system of Machihara allows the user to retrieve desired information from a plurality of storage locations and database systems by simply specifying retrieval content and retrieval conditions using words familiar to the user, without having to know the names for the relevant database or their system structures or to interact with the meta-information platform (Machihara, col. 3, lines 26-32). The query in the Machihara uses words familiar to the user, which are known on both the query side and database side. Clearly, these query words/descriptors used by the user are the standard structure.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is unclear to the examiner whether the applicant means "and" or "or" for the limitation "and/or", therefore, the examiner interprets the "and/or" term as or. Appropriate correction for all claims with "and/or" is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machihara et al. ("Machihara", 6,233,578).

As per claim 1, Machihara discloses a method for querying a database with database contents with a database structure comprising:

placing a query in a query structure that differs from the database structure and a reference logic (Machihara, col. 3, lines 26-62) is at least one of:

at least partially transmitted together with the query; and is at least partially present in the database (Machihara, col. 3, lines 26-62),

wherein the reference logic provides a link between the query structure and the database structure (Machihara, Abstract, col. 3, lines 26-62, col. 5, lines 18-20).

Machihara does not explicitly disclose a standard structure. However, as set forth on lines 25-28 of page 3 of the specification, in the present application descriptors such as "catalog number," "data," ... are defined as standard descriptors, typically in string format, and are known on both the query side and database side for a standard structure. The information retrieval system of Machihara allows the user to retrieve desired information from a plurality of storage locations and database systems by simply specifying retrieval content and retrieval conditions

Art Unit: 2172

using words familiar to the user, without having to know the names for the relevant database or their system structures or to interact with the meta-information platform (Machihara, col. 3, lines 26-32). The query in the Machihara uses words familiar to the user, which are known on both the query side and database side. It is obvious these query words/descriptors used by the user are the standard structure and links the query structure and the database structure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the standard structure in the method of Machihara in order to link the query structure and the database structure.

As per claim 2, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses the reference logic is stored in the database (Machihara, col. 3, lines 33-62).

As per claim 3, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses the standard structure is described by standard descriptors, and the query structure and the database structure are described by these standard descriptors and/or more special descriptors, wherein these more special descriptors reference the standard descriptors via the reference logic (Machihara, col. 3, lines 26-62, col. 5, lines 29-45, col. 6, lines 17-62).

As per claim 4, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, and further discloses standard descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the standard descriptors of the database, wherein identical standard descriptors are evaluated for the query (Machihara, col. 10, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

As per claim 5, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, and further discloses the special descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the

Art Unit: 2172

special descriptors of the database, wherein identical special descriptors are evaluated for the query (Machihara, col. 10, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

As per claim 6, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, and further discloses dissimilar special descriptors are reviewed to determine whether a computation logic is present in the database, so that a respective special descriptor of the database structure can be computed directly from the corresponding special descriptor of the query structure by means of the computation logic (Machihara, Fig. 2 & 3, col. 10, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

As per claim 7, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further discloses the computation logic is stored in the database (Machihara, Fig. 2 & 3).

As per claim 8, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses for dissimilar special descriptors for which no computation logic is present, a review is made to determine whether a reference logic to standard descriptors is at least partially present in the database (Machihara, Fig. 1-3, col. 10, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

As per claim 9, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses for dissimilar special descriptors for which no computation logic and/or no reference logic is present, a review is made to determine whether the reference logic was transmitted together with the query (Machihara, Fig. 1-3, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

As per claim 10, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses atomic elements defining the information and/or link of a special descriptor are used as the computation logic (Machihara, Fig. 1-3, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 11, Machihara teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, and further discloses the atomic elements used are semantic, physical and linking atomic elements to define the semantic meaning, the physical memory structure, and the link between memory structure and semantics (Machihara, Fig. 1-3, line 52 - col. 11, line 65).

Claims 12-22 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-11.

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-3.

5. Claims 34, 36, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappenberger et al. ("Kappenberger", 6,345,269).

As per claim 34, Kappenberger teaches a method of querying a plurality of databases, comprising:

submitting a query in an original query structure to a plurality of databases (Kappenberger, Fig. 3, col. 2, lines 61-67); and

separately revising the original query structure at each of the databases, to produce query structures searchable within the respective databases (Kappenberger, col. 2, lines 61-67, col. 3, lines 47-56),

wherein the original query structure is revised in a decentralized fashion, without middleware (Kappenberger, col. 1, lines 60-63),

wherein the special descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the special descriptors of the database, wherein identical special descriptors are evaluated for the

Art Unit: 2172

query so that the reference logic provides a link between the original query structure and the database structure (Kappenberger, col. 2, lines 61-67, col. 3, lines 47-56).

Kappenberger does not explicitly disclose a standard structure. However, as set forth on lines 25-28 of page 3 of the specification, in the present application descriptors such as “catalog number,” “data,” ... are defined as standard descriptors, typically in string format, and are known on both the query side and database side for a standard structure. The information retrieval system of Kappenberger allows the user to retrieve desired information from database systems by simply specifying retrieval content and retrieval conditions using words familiar to the user, without having to know the specific names for the relevant database (Kappenberger, col. line 61 – col. 4, line 56). It is obvious these query descriptors used by the user are the standard structure and links the query structure and the database structure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the standard structure in the method of Kappenberger in order to link the query structure and the database structure.

As per claim 36, Kappenberger teaches a method of querying a plurality of databases, comprising:

submitting a query to a plurality of databases the query containing information fields not contained in all of the databases (Kappenberger, Fig. 3, col. 1, lines 60-63, col. 2, lines 61-67); and

separately searching for the query at the plurality of databases, each database using a reference logic at the database to infer a relationship between fields in the database and fields in the query not contained in the database (Kappenberger, Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 47-56),

wherein the original query structure is revised in a decentralized fashion, without middleware (Kappenberger, col. 1, lines 60-63),

wherein the special descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the special descriptors of the database, wherein identical special descriptors are evaluated for the query so that the reference logic provides a link between the original query structure and the database structure (Kappenberger, col. 2, lines 61-67, col. 3, lines 47-56).

Kappenberger does not explicitly disclose a standard structure. However, as set forth on lines 25-28 of page 3 of the specification, in the present application descriptors such as “catalog number,” “data,” ... are defined as standard descriptors, typically in string format, and are known on both the query side and database side for a standard structure. The information retrieval system of Kappenberger allows the user to retrieve desired information from database systems by simply specifying retrieval content and retrieval conditions using words familiar to the user, without having to know the specific names for the relevant database (Kappenberger, col. line 61 – col. 4, line 56). It is obvious these query descriptors used by the user are the standard structure and links the query structure and the database structure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the standard structure in the method of Kappenberger in order to link the query structure and the database structure.

Claim 38 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 34.

Art Unit: 2172


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 20, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER